REMARKS

Claims 23-97 and 104-108 are pending in the application.

Claims 23-97 and 104-108 have been rejected.

Claims 23, 37, 42, 44, 45, 60, 65, 67, 68, 83, 88, 90, 91, 96, and 97 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 23-29, 36-51, 59-74, 82-97, 104-106, and 108 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,657,990 issued to Dilip et al. ("Dilip") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,675 issued to Schneider ("Schneider"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 30-35, 52-58 and 75-81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dilip and Schneider in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,332,154 issued to Beck et al. ("Beck"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 107 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dilip in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,778,661 issued to Yumoto et al. ("Yumoto"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 23 recites as follows:

23. An apparatus comprising:
a processor; and
a communication server, executed by said processor, which is configured to communicate with a communication channel by virtue of being configured to
receive an incoming communication from the communication channel via a channel driver communicatively coupled to the communication channel, wherein
the channel driver is configured to communicate with the communication channel by virtue of being configured according to a media type of the communication channel, and
the media type of the communication channel is one of a plurality of media types, and
cause an outgoing communication to be sent to the communication channel via the channel driver, wherein
the communication server is further configured to communicate with the communication channel, without information regarding the media type of the communication channel, by virtue of being configured to communicate with the communication channel via the channel driver, and
the communication server and channel driver are configured to communicate with one another by virtue of a communication application program interface.

The Office Action relies on Dilip and Schneider, in combination, to disclose the limitations of Claim 23. *See* Office Action, pp. 2-4. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Dilip and Schneider, alone or in combination, fail to show, teach, or even suggest all the limitations of Claim 23.

The Office Action attempts to equate both Dilip's control server and Dilip's server core with the claimed communication server. *See* Office Action, pp. 2, 18. Aside from the logical inconsistency of such a position (that is, attempting to equate both with the claimed communication server), Applicants respectfully submit that both Dilip's control server and Dilip's server core, even separately, still fail to show, teach, or even suggest the limitations of Claim 23.

First, Applicants respectfully submit that equating Dilip's control server with the claimed communication server fails to teach a communication server that is configured to communicate with the communication channel, without information regarding the media type of the communication channel, by virtue of being configured to communicate with the communication channel via the channel driver. The cited sections of Dilip provide that a control server includes, among other components, a central control module, a transaction processing system manager, and a number of media-specific transaction managers. *See* Dilip, Fig. 3. In addition, the cited sections of Dilip further provide that each transaction manager handles a particular type of transaction and communicates with the server responsible for that transaction type. *See* Dilip, 9:11-14. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the structure and function of the control server are not comparable to the claimed communication server. This is at least because the claimed communication server is configured to communicate independently of a media type of a communication channel. Applicants respectfully note that the claim language makes this abundantly clear, in reciting a "communication server [that] is further configured to communicate with the communication channel, without information regarding the media type of the communication channel, by virtue of being configured to communicate with the communication channel via the channel driver." As discussed in further detail below, these limitations distinguish the claimed invention from the cited sections of Dilip and Schneider.

Dilip's control server does not (and cannot) provide media-independent communication because Dilip's control server itself includes the transaction managers. As disclosed above, these transactions managers are specifically configured to handle a particular type of transaction and are an integral component of Dilip's control server. *Id.*

Thus, Dilip's control server fails to enjoy media-independent communication to the control server because, for Dilip's control server to support a new media type, Dilip's control server must be customized to support the new media type by being heavily modified. By stark contrast, the claimed communication server need only have a new channel driver (supporting the new media type) made available thereto. Once the communication server is able to access the new channel driver (using a standard interface common to all such channel drivers and used by the communication server to communicate therewith), the communication server is able to communicate with the new communication channel (that employs the need media type) via the channel driver. The communication server is therefore able to communicate with the new communication channel without any modifications being made to the communication server (again, in stark contrast to Dilip). Therefore, Dilip's control server fails to show, teach, or even suggest a communication server configured to communicate independently of a media type of a communication channel by virtue of being configured to communicate with a communication channel via a channel driver.

In this vein, Applicants respectfully submit that equating Dilip's server core with the claimed communications server also fails to teach that a communication server and a channel driver are configured to communicate with one another by virtue of a communication application program interface. The Office Action asserts that Dilip's server core within Dilip's central control module enables media-independent communication by interfacing with a transaction management interface, which contacts an appropriate transaction manager. *See* Office Action, p. 18. Applicants respectfully submit that even if Dilip's server core could somehow be equated to the claimed communication server (a point Applicants do not concede), the cited sections of Dilip still

fail to teach the claimed communication server and a channel driver, which communicate with one another by virtue of a communication application program interface, for at least the foregoing reasons.

In an attempt to cure this infirmity, the Office Action relies on Schneider to disclose a communication application program interface (API). *See* Office Action, pp. 3-4. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Schneider's API fails to provide how Dilip's control server could be modified to support a new media type without any modifications being made to the control server. In fact, nothing in Schneider provides for a simple integration method, such as that recited in Claim 23, in which a new media type can be added to a communication server by simply adding a new channel driver supporting the new media type which can communicate with the communication server via a communication application program interface.

In addition, the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Dilip and Schneider. *See* Office Action, p. 4. However, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the teachings of Dilip and Schneider because combining Dilip and Schneider would be redundant. Both Dilip and Schneider currently provide an interface for allowing the exchange of messages between a module and a transaction manager. For example, the cited sections of Dilip provide that a transaction management interface is used to manage interactions and exchange information between a central control module and various transaction managers. *See* Dilip, 9:8-11. Similarly, the cited sections of Schneider provide an API is used to provide and interface between a transaction manager and a physical file system to allow for the transmittal of messages between these two components. *See* Schneider, 4:7-16. Therefore, any possible

combination of Dilip and Schneider would be redundant because Dilip and Schneider both teach interfaces that are intended to serve the same purpose. Hence, taken in any possible combination, combining the disclosures of Dilip and Schneider would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Dilip and Schneider, alone or in combination, fail to show, teach, or even suggest all the limitations of Claim 23. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 23, and all claims depending therefrom.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 37, 42, 44, 45, 60, 65, 67, 68, 83, 88, 90, 91, 96, and 97 contain limitations that are similar to those of Claim 23. Particularly, Claims 37, 42, 44, 45, 60, 65, 67, 68, 83, 88, 90, 91, 96, and 97 provide for a communication server configured to communicate independently of a media type of a communication channel by virtue of being configured to communicate with a communication channel via the channel driver, and provide for a communication server and a channel driver configured to communicate with one another by virtue of a communication application program interface. As such, Applicants respectfully reiterate the above made remarks with regards to Claim 23. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 37, 42, 44, 45, 60, 65, 67, 68, 83, 88, 90, 91, 96, and 97, and all claims depending therefrom.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5094.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

Ana D. Luther

Ana G. Luther
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 61,704
Telephone: (512) 439-5094
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099